TARGET AUDIENCE: Operations Chiefs, VCOs and VCNCOs



99-25 JUNE 1999

The Vehicle Priority Buy Program: Background

SYNOPSIS:

This supersedes A-Gram 95-69, dated December 1995. It is the first of three A-Grams on the Vehicle Priority Buy Program.

The Vehicle Priority Buy Program provides major commands and field operating agencies the opportunity to influence the types and quantities of vehicles to be included in buy/budget programs. It ensures that base needs are elevated and the limited funding to buy new or replacement vehicles is spent to meet mission requirements. This Air Force process gives step-by-step procedures to be used by MAJCOMs and bases and guarantees an even distribution of funds. When followed, this program identifies the Air Force's most critically needed vehicles and rank orders them in priority sequence for acquisition.

WHY SHOULD I BE INTERESTED?

Civil engineers operate over 30 percent (in dollar value) of the AF vehicle fleet. Although we operate 30 percent of the AF vehicle fleet, we are only receiving 6 percent of the vehicle replacement budget. If this trend continues, more than 56 percent of our vehicle fleet, including readiness assets, will need replacement by the year 2000. We suspect a large percentage of the replacement eligible vehicles are, in fact, in poor condition and frustrate mission success, but are not adequately reflected in the AF Priority Buy Program. Understanding this program and how you can influence its outcome could change the appearance of your squadron's vehicle fleet.

HOW WAS IT DONE AND WHO DID IT BEFORE?

In the past, HQ AFCESA advocated the purchase of high cost items like snow removal and base maintenance equipment and fire crash/rescue trucks. This worked well until the budget reached such low levels that special, off-the-top programs were consuming the entire vehicle budget and bases were not getting their most critically needed vehicles.

To bring the program back to its original charter of supporting base needs, HQ USAF/ILSR (Vehicular Equipment Section) and WR-ALC/LE (Vehicle Management Directorate) canceled all off-the-top programs and several ongoing contracts. The standing rule now is: if it's not a priority requirement with the bases and reflected in their priority buy submittal, it's not going to be bought. Advocacy by AFCESA is no longer an option.

HOW DO I GET STARTED?

First, it's important to understand that vehicles are NOT automatically replaced at a predetermined date but become eligible candidates for replacement based on assigned predetermined conditions. In some cases, the conditions assigned to a vehicle are drastic enough that the continued operation of the



vehicle may cause limited mission degradation. These vehicles may be in poor condition and still not be replaced, while others in less serious condition but that are deemed vital to mission support, may be replaced. The actual decision to replace a vehicle is made by base-level management, based on the most critical need and the dollars available.

Critical needs are communicated to the transportation community by each using activity through some form of impact statement. Justifications must be strong and accurate because we are competing for fewer fiscal resources. To assist you in this effort, here are some points to consider to enhance justifications for vehicle replacements in the AF Priority Buy Program:

- a. Gaining our fair share of vehicle support requires rapport with base transportation mainte-nance and operations. Unit vehicle control officers and NCOs should have frequent contact with maintenance and operations activities in the transportation squadron. Also, since most wings have not continued vehicle authorization and utilization boards, the CE commander should seek other methods to review vehicle program activity.
- b. The local vehicle maintenance activity is the source of data to indicate downtime, downtime frequencies, and maintenance expenditures. Support from this activity to transportation operations is essential in compiling impact of downtime on the CE mission.
- c. Requests for vehicle support (approved and disapproved) from base transportation for replacement vehicles (U-drive-it) during long maintenance downtimes, along with requests for rentals and leases, are great support in documenting requirements.
- d. The costs of rental or leased vehicles as compared to direct ownership. An asset that requires intermittent and frequent rental usually proves more cost-effective to own. Conversely, except at remote locations, an AF-owned asset used only once or twice a year usually proves more cost-effective to rent.
- e. Workload vs special purpose vehicle availability. Document work backlog frustrated by lack of special purpose vehicles.
- f. Inability to maintain required standards may be quantifiable. Standards could relate to readiness posture, foreign object damage prevention, snow and ice removal, maintenance of utility distribution systems, or environmental regulations. Specific documentation of failure to meet standards for lack of authorized equipment is valuable.

CONTACT:

Mr. Dave Wagner HQ AFCESA/CEOM 139 Barnes Drive Suite 1 Tyndall AFB FL 32403-5319 DSN 523-6388 Comm 850-283-6388 e-mail: dave.wagner@afcesa.af.mil